

CIVIL LIBERTIES IN HONG KONG

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, 8 months ago I took the floor in this Chamber to call attention to some disturbing trends with regard to democracy and civil liberties in Hong Kong. I said that Hong Kong's rulers, at the behest of Beijing, were set upon a path that risked destroying the spirit and vitality that make Hong Kong unique. I urged those who care about Hong Kong, and about freedom, to speak out and alert Hong Kong authorities to the error of their ways. Many did so.

Today, I regret to report, Hong Kong is one step closer to becoming just another Chinese city. Hong Kong's Legislative Council is expected to vote into law next month antismuggling legislation that would significantly erode the barriers that insulate Hong Kong's residents from the antidemocratic legal concepts and practices of the People's Republic of China.

As I said here last October, China's leaders pressured their hand-picked Chief Executive in Hong Kong, Tung Chee-Hwa, to introduce this legislation last year. Hong Kong authorities maintained that they had no choice but to comply, since Article 23 of the Basic Law that became Hong Kong's constitution after the territory reverted from British to Chinese control in 1997 required Hong Kong to adopt laws to protect national security. Many Hong Kong legal experts disagreed. But be that as it may, the same Basic Law says the territory will move toward electing its legislature and executive by universal suffrage. At present, only one-third of the legislators were chosen by direct popular vote, and only 800 of Hong Kong's 7 million residents were allowed to cast ballots in Tung Chee-Hwa's reelection as Chief Executive last year. The Government has yet to announce any plans to expand suffrage.

The sequence of these steps is important. Pushing through legislation curtailing civil liberties to comply with Article 23 before establishing a democratic legislature per Article 68 violates the most fundamental tenet of popular rule—that governmental authority is derived from the consent of the governed. The Hong Kong authorities invited public comments on the legislation, both in its initial outline form and later detailed drafts. But despite serious objections from journalists, lawyers, chambers of commerce, human rights activists, religious groups, and other interested parties, the bill on which the Legislative Council is expected to vote next month reflects only minor revisions from the Government's original draft. Without a legislature accountable to the citizenry, the people were free to speak their views, but the Government was free to ignore them.

As a result, most of the concerns I raised about the legislative proposal last October remain unaddressed:

Definitions of offenses such as "subversion," "sedition" and "secession" are extremely vague, permitting secu-

rity officials to prosecute people arbitrarily, as they do on the Mainland.

Merely "handling" publications the authorities consider to be "seditious" would be a criminal offense, as would "intimidating" the Government in Beijing or acting to "disestablish" the "basic system" of China—meaning the political monopoly of the Communist Party—or endangering China's "stability."

"Inciting" subversion, even if only through speech, would be criminalized. In China, workers have been given long prison sentences for "inciting subversion" for simply demanding to be paid. Others have received 10-year terms for criticizing the Government on the Internet.

Hong Kong affiliates of organizations that Beijing decides threaten national security may be banned. This provision is likely to be used to ban Falun Gong, and conceivably it could be applied to the Roman Catholic Church if it does not renounce its ties to Rome. Hong Kong groups that monitor human rights and labor conditions in China have also been labeled "hostile foreign elements" by Mainland authorities and thus could be targeted.

Police will be permitted to enter and search private residences and seize property without a warrant.

Journalists and others could be prosecuted for the unauthorized disclosure of official secrets or information related to Hong Kong affairs that are the responsibility of the Central Government. Recall that for 5 months, Mainland authorities treated information about SARS as an official secret, and the world learned about the epidemic only after it spread to Hong Kong. Disclosing that information was clearly in the public's interest. But this bill does not allow a public interest defense, nor is there any counterbalancing right-to-know or freedom-of-information legislation. If this bill becomes law, how long will it take us to find out about China's next epidemic?

These proposed revisions to Hong Kong's laws, demanded by Beijing, run counter to China's commitment in the 1984 Sino-British Declaration to preserve Hong Kong's civil liberties for at least 50 years following the handover. They would significantly undermine such internationally recognized basic human rights as freedom of expression, freedom of association, and freedom of conscience, and potentially threaten freedom of religion and the right to due process as well.

Hong Kong's democratic politicians, activists, attorneys, journalists, and other professionals are understandably alarmed about this legislation. To hear some of them tell it, passage of this bill will mean the end of Hong Kong as we know it. In reality, I suspect most Hong Kong residents would wake up on July 10 to find life in their city essentially unchanged. The effects of this legislation will appear only gradually and incrementally. The first to feel the impact will probably be groups on the

margins of Hong Kong society, such as Falun Gong practitioners. Perhaps most Hong Kongers will say nothing, because they are not Falun Gong practitioners. But over time, they will come to find themselves living in a poorer place, and the world will be poorer as a result.

If this legislation passes in its present form, it promises to make Hong Kong poorer in more ways than one. Last December, the American Chamber of Commerce in Hong Kong wrote the Government to express its concern about the bill's potential impact on the free flow of information, which it said was essential for the operation of Hong Kong's markets and for maintaining its competitiveness as a business location. The letter came a few weeks after a senior analyst at Bank of China International resigned after China's Premier criticized one of his reports. The British Chamber of Commerce warned Hong Kong could become "a much less favorable location for international business" if investors could not obtain free and unfettered information. Some analysts have suggested that investment on the Chinese Mainland could suffer as well, since foreign firms operating in China often rely on their Hong Kong offices for uncensored information about the Mainland.

Through the United States-Hong Kong Policy Act of 1992, Congress made support for human rights and democratization in Hong Kong a fundamental principle of United States foreign policy. As a concrete expression of support for Hong Kong's continued autonomy, the act stipulated that Hong Kong would continue to receive the same treatment under most United States laws after the handover as it had before. However, it allowed the President to suspend that provision on a case by case basis, whenever he determined that Hong Kong was no longer sufficiently autonomous to justify being treated differently from the rest of China under a particular law. This is not a decision the President should take lightly. However, if the proposed legislation compromises the independence of Hong Kong's judicial system or the integrity of its financial markets, as some analysts fear, the President would have no choice but to review specific United States statutes to evaluate whether separate treatment for Hong Kong can still be justified.

I hope we never get to that point. I hope that Hong Kong's freedom and its creativity can be preserved and that its people will be given more say in how they are governed, not less. For that reason, I urge those in the Hong Kong Government and Legislative Council who care about Hong Kong's future—and I am sure most of them do—to turn back from the course they are on before it is too late.

CBO COST ESTIMATE

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate for S. 498, the Joseph A. De Laine Congressional Gold Medal bill, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, June 19, 2003.

Hon. RICHARD C. SHELBY,

Chairman, Committee on Banking, Housing,
and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed estimate for S. 498, a bill to authorize the President to posthumously award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Joseph A. De Laine in recognition of his contributions to the nation.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Matthew Pickford.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS HOLTZ-EAKIN,
Director.

Enclosure

S. 498—A bill to authorize the President to posthumously award a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Joseph A. De Laine in recognition of his contributions to the nation

S. 709 would authorize the President to award posthumously a gold medal to Joseph De Laine Jr. to honor Reverend Joseph Anthony De Laine on behalf of the Congress for his civil rights contributions to the nation. The legislation would authorize the U.S. Mint to spend up to \$30,000 to produce the gold medal. To help recover the costs of the medal, S. 498 would authorize the Mint to strike and sell bronze duplicates of the medal at a price that covers production costs for both the medal and the duplicates.

Based on the costs of recent medals produced by the Mint, CBO estimates that the bill would not significantly increase direct spending from the U.S. Mint Public Enterprise Fund. We estimate that the gold medal would cost about \$25,000 to produce in fiscal years 2003 and 2004, including around \$5,000 for the cost of the gold and around \$20,000 for the costs to design, engrave, and manufacture the medal. CBO expects that the Mint would recoup little of its costs by selling bronze duplicates to the public.

S. 498 contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would not affect the budgets of state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Matthew Pickford. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

TRIBUTE TO JANINE LOUISE JOHNSON

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, it is with great sadness that I pay tribute to Janine Johnson, who for over 12 years served the Senate, its Members and staff as an assistant counsel in the Office of Legislative Counsel. Janine died on May 29, 2003 at the far too young age of 37.

In reality, there is little my words can add to the memorial Janine herself built through her outstanding legal

skills, extraordinary dedication and uncommon kindness and personal grace. She will be remembered for her positive impact on the laws she helped so much to enact and for the example and fond memories she has left her colleagues and friends.

Janine came to work in the Senate Office of Legislative Counsel with an already full set of accomplishments: first in her high school class of 333 in Winchester, Massachusetts; National Merit Scholar; cum laude graduate of both Harvard College and Harvard Law School; a federal circuit court clerkship with Judge Cecil F. Poole on the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit; member of the Massachusetts Bar.

We are fortunate that Janine built on that record by bringing her excellent qualifications and talent to the Senate. Beginning in February of 1991, she drafted many bills and amendments for committees and individual members and their staffs. Her work, which was primarily in the areas of the environment, public works, agriculture, nutrition and natural resources, contributed to a long list of enacted legislation.

In addition to numerous environmental and public works laws, including the Water Resources Development Acts of 1996 and 2000, and the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century of 1998, Janine contributed greatly to writing the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 and the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002. And though her efforts helped better our Nation, and even other parts of the world, only a very few people have any idea or appreciation of Janine's work.

That is just the way Janine would have it. She was a private person who did not seek the limelight. Instead, she quietly went about doing excellent work as the consummate professional she was. She was meticulous, detail-oriented and precise, as one would want someone drafting important legislation to be, with an uncanny ability to take concepts and ideas and shape them into exact language carefully crafted to fit into the federal statutory scheme. To cite an example, Janine was the lead legislative counsel in drafting the nutrition title of the 2002 farm bill. Especially in a bill as extensive and complex as the farm bill, it is the rule that drafting errors are to be expected. To this day, not one error has been found in the drafting of the 2002 farm bill's nutrition title.

Janine willingly put in the extra hours so often required to produce such high-quality work while meeting the demanding time constraints of the legislative process. She was a very patient and stabilizing force in what are frequently pressurized circumstances—someone who also took pride in cultivating and maintaining good relations with both sides of the aisle and all sides of the various issues she worked on.

In short, Janine Johnson exemplified the fine professional qualities that are

characteristic of the Senate Office of Legislative Counsel. She distinguished herself by setting a high standard within an office known for its high standards.

Janine's death is a terrible loss, and yet as we consider her very substantial and lasting accomplishments and contributions—and more importantly the memories of her that live on—it is fitting to recall the words of John Donne: Death be not proud, though some have called thee

Mighty and dreadful, for, thou art not so,
For, those, whom thou think'st, thou dost overthrow,

Die not, poore death, nor yet canst thou kill me.

I offer my condolences and kind wishes to Janine's family, friends and colleagues as they mourn her passing.

CREATING AN ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MANUFACTURING IN THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to ask my colleagues' support for legislation I have introduced creating the new position of Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing in the Department of Commerce.

In America we are blessed with ingenuity, gumption, and a can-do spirit that is recognized around the world. At the turn of the last century we helped lead the world into the Industrial age. American inventors gave electricity and air travel to the world.

As we enter the 21st century, American manufacturing has as much potential as it has ever had at any time in our Nation's history. Accomplishments in the high-tech industry have been rapidly integrated into manufacturing to make our factories and our workers more productive, reduce costs, and save time.

At the same time, substantial new trade, training, energy, labor, and foreign competition challenges have arisen. Helping our manufacturing interests deal with these challenges is something that private sector organizations such as the National Association Manufacturers have done well for years. It only stands to reason that we focus resources in the Government sector in support of manufacturing as well.

I am concerned about the slow economic recovery and our Nation's declining position in the global marketplace, particularly for manufacturing, which is the backbone of our economy, both in Ohio and the Nation. There is a genuine panic by the manufacturing community over their future and the jobs created from manufacturing. They feel they are under siege from environmental regulations, rising health care costs, litigation, escalating natural gas costs, and the prospect of dramatically higher electricity costs if energy reform legislation is not passed.

First, health care costs continue to rise. Nationwide, we have seen double-digit increases in health care premiums over the last 2 years alone. In